

Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of *Chrysodema* Laporte & Gory, 1835 and *Iridotaenia* Deyrolle, 1864 (Insecta, Coleoptera) by the designation of *C. somerati* Laporte & Gory, 1835 as the type species of *Chrysodema*
(Case 3193; see BZN 59: 185–187, 281)

Richard Westcott

Entomology Museum, Oregon Department of Agriculture, 635 Capitol, N.E. Salem, Oregon, U.S.A.

I support this proposal wholeheartedly, as it will conserve the existing usage of the generic names for two large, well known and widely studied groups of beetles.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Pelastoneurus* Loew, 1861 (Insecta, Diptera)

(Case 3130; see BZN 59: 196–197)

Jeffrey M. Cumming and J. Richard Vockeroth

Systematic Entomology Section, ECORC, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0C6 Canada

We support the application of Brooks, Wheeler & Evenhuis (made under Article 23.9.3 of the Code) for conservation of the generic name *Pelastoneurus* Loew, 1861 by suppression of the generic name *Paracleius* Bigot, 1859. Although it is a junior synonym, the name *Pelastoneurus* has been used by almost all authors for this diverse and widespread genus of flies. Suppression of the generic name *Paracleius* has been previously recommended by Robinson (1970) and Dyte (1975).

Furthermore, use of the senior synonym *Paracleius* would continue to cause confusion with the generic name *Paraclius* Loew, 1864, which is used for a separate nominal genus with a nearly cosmopolitan distribution. The genus *Paraclius* was established by Loew (1864, p. 97) in the same publication in which he (pp. 99–100) considered *Paracleius* to be a senior subjective synonym of *Pelastoneurus*. In proposing the name *Paraclius*, Loew (1864) indicated that he was creating a new genus that was not congeneric with *Paracleius* Bigot, 1859. Loew stated (1864, pp. 99–100) that he saw ‘no inconvenience in retaining the newly coined name . . . *Paraclius*, for the new genus I intend to establish and to define here’. However, Kertész (1909, p. 230) emended the spelling of *Paracleius* Bigot, 1859 to *Paraclius* and listed *Paraclius* Kertész as a senior synonym of *Pelastoneurus* Loew. Apparently Kertész was not aware that his emended name was preoccupied by *Paraclius* Loew, 1864. This confusion has continued with several regional catalogues (namely Foote et al., 1965; Robinson, 1970; Dyte, 1975 and Negrobov, 1991, but not Dyte & Smith, 1980) incorrectly treating *Paraclius* Loew, 1864 as an emendation of *Paracleius* Bigot, 1859. Despite this confusion Robinson (1970) correctly listed *Paracleius* as a senior synonym of *Pelastoneurus*, although this synonymy was not listed in the other regional catalogues mentioned, including the one by Dyte & Smith (1980).

Additional references

Kertész, C. 1909. *Catalogus Dipteriorum Hucusque Descriptorum*, vol. 6. 362 pp. Budapest.

- Loew, H. 1864. Monographs of the Diptera of North America. Part II. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, 6(2 [= pub. 171]): 1–360.
- Negrobov, O.P. 1991. Family Dolichopodidae. Pp. 11–139 in Soos, A. & Papp, L. (Eds.), *Catalogue of Palaearctic Diptera*, vol. 7. Dolichopodidae – Platypezidae. 291 pp. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Nemotois violellus* Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851 (currently *Nemophora violella*; Insecta, Lepidoptera)

(Case 3188; see BZN 59: 30–33)

(1) Erik J. van Nieukerken

National Museum of Natural History, Naturalis, PO Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

1. I am not in agreement with the proposal put forward in this application. Kozlov's proposal to suppress the name *Tinea cupriacella* Hübner, 1819 in order to conserve the name of *Nemotois violellus* Herrich-Schaeffer in Stainton, 1851 (which he considers to be a junior synonym of *T. cupriacella*) centres around three problems. These are: (i) the status of Hübner's name, (ii) the parthenogenetic nature of the species currently known as *Nemophora cupriacella* (Hübner, 1819), and (iii) the supposed 'confusion' around the name *T. cupriacella*.

2. I agree with any action that will conserve the name *Nemophora violella*, but strongly disagree with the proposal to suppress the well-known name *Nemophora cupriacella* for the moth species that feeds on several Dipsacaceae species. The suppression of a name in use for 180 years as a result of re-examination of a very old plate does not follow the spirit of the Code. Thus, I would like to support the alternative proposal, indicated by Kozlov (BZN 59: 32), which involves the designation of a neotype for *Tinea cupriacella*. My argument in support of this approach follows the three points listed above.

The status of Hübner's name

3. *Tinea cupriacella* was made available only by an illustration of the moth. Type material is not known to exist and Hübner provided no description of the species. The moth shown on the colour plate is clearly an adelid moth, and resembles species of the genus *Nemophora*. The long antennae indicate that it is a male, and its identification by Kozlov as the species currently called *Nemophora violella* could be correct. However, the figure could also represent one of a number of related species, including the (unknown) male of *N. cupriacella* of present authors. All later authors based the identity of *N. cupriacella* on the works of Herrich-Schaeffer (1854, p. 96) and Zeller (1853, p. 57), who described and distinguished both *N. cupriacella* and *N. violella* (see below).

The parthenogenetic nature of the species currently known as *Nemophora cupriacella* (Hübner, 1819)

4. The parthenogenetic nature of *N. cupriacella* was not recognized before 1978 (Suomalainen, 1978). However, many earlier authors mentioned that they only knew